

Superior Statutes :

There are 4 'Superior Statutes' ... They have 'Express Words' - They last for all time & forever - No one can go beyond these Superior Statutes - In perpetuity (and it writes Every Future Monarch **will abide**).

These 4 Acts are Constitutional Law - They Supersede ANY Act or Statute created by way of what happened since 1973; IT VOIDS THEM.

Coronation Oath 1688 :

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/cy/aep/WillandMar/1/6/introduction/1991-02-01>

Bill Of Rights 1688 :

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/aep/WillandMarSess2/1/2/introduction>

Act Of Settlement 1700 :

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/aep/Will3/12-13/2>

Treason Act 1795 :

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/apgb/Geo3/36/7/introduction/1991-02-01>

The Werner Report 1968, published in 1970 – was a report informing the UK that if it joins the EEC/EU (warning in the first 30 pages) the UK will lose Sovereignty.

https://ec.europa.eu/economy_finance/publications/pages/publication6142_en.pdf

The then PM, Edward Heath and his co-conspirators, were intent to take away FULL SOVEREIGNTY of this country.

In 1971, an FCO memorandum known as FCO30/1048 was drafted, and details how the UK would surrender sovereignty if it were to join the EEC/EU. It was buried for 5 decades.

<https://petition.parliament.uk/archived/petitions/162714>

Verbatim :

"The surrender of sovereign powers, as a consequence of signing the Treaty of Rome, Maastricht, and Lisbon, is in breach of the British Constitution as detailed in the Bill of Rights 1688. This Bill has never been repealed, and as such still in force."

In order for the government to hide and deflect their crimes, Edward Heath set up the 1975 referendum, whilst withholding the knowledge of surrendering sovereignty. Of the votes, 68% voted yes to join – 32% voted no.

In 1973, the Monarch of the day was deposed. Treason was committed under the Treason Act 1795 and thus any Acts or Statutes post 1973 are void. The 68% mentioned above, also committed Treason.

The headline and subsequent article in the Express dated 28th September 2018:

“REVEALED : How Whitehall thought British public TOO STUPID to be trusted with EU decision”

<https://www.express.co.uk/news/politics/883540/FCO-30-1048-Brexit-EU-secret-document-damned-Britain-EU-membership>

When they deposed her, they gave her another title; **The Head of State**.

A professor at London School of Economics gave a definition of a state; “**A State is a Corporation**”.

She became the **Head of a Corporation, CEO of UK PLC**.

She swore an Oath in 1953, to govern us by the “laws of God and The Gospels”. For those that understand contract law (she signed at the top) – You read it and apply your mind, to accept the contract, basic contract law ... She signed at the top, and this is deception. She could never be beholden to the Oath she took.

We do not rely on her or her oath; We The People rely on the Coronation Oath 1688, and their Express Words – She is/was irrelevant.

The people of Great Britain have only ever consented to a Constitution, not to a corporation. Every govt since Edward Heath are guilty of treason; Treason Act 1795 : To depose a Monarch is Treason.

From 1973, is what is known as **Colour of Law** only. It is **without legal right** – They stepped outside the Constitution and created a corporation and engaged with a Foreign Federal State known as the EU. Intent on destroying our Sovereignty

Any PM on tv for eg, with the EU are “Overtly” engaging with a foreign state – And as it clearly states in the Treason Act 1795;

Verbatim :

“**F1** shall, within the realm or without compass, imagine, invent, devise or intend death or destruction, or any bodily harm tending to death or destruction, maim or wounding, imprisonment or restraint, of the person of . . . **F2** our sovereign lord the King, his heirs and successors, . . . **F3** and such compassings, imaginations, inventions, devices or intentions, or any of them, shall express, utter or declare, by publishing any printing or writing, or by any **overt** act or deed, being **legally** convicted thereof upon the oaths of two lawful and credible witnesses upon trial, or otherwise convicted or attainted by due course of law, then every such person and persons so as aforesaid offending shall be deemed, declared and adjudged to be a traitor and traitors, and shall suffer pains of death, . . . **F4** as in cases of high treason.”

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/apgb/Geo3/36/7/1991-02-01/data.pdf>

Furthermore, in the quote above, “ ... being legally ... ” – the word ‘legal’ is an agreed rule in a society; The question is, ‘Are we in their society?’ and the answer is NO! It’s legal in their society but not in any jurisdiction outside of that said society.

This again, the government is not ‘**Regall**’, it’s illegitimate, they are CORRUPT, and have and are still committing Treason.

There was an argument that Tony Blair repealed the Treason Act 1795 – He was and still is committing Treason, and thus CANNOT repeal the Act that makes him accountable. And thus, a traitor. Guilty of Treason.

In parliament, you have a seat called a Remembrancer and is seated beside Lindsay Hoyle, the Speaker of the House.

The Remembrancer is an agent of a Foreign State called the Inner City of London; which controls the stock markets and all financial and securitised instruments, amongst many other things.

The stock market motif is the Rothchild’s badge; looks like a George’s Cross, but it’s actually an upside-down sword.

Lest not forget, everything passed since 1973 are VOID.

The Local Government Act 1972, which instituted statutory officers in councils, was the beginning of the corporate takeover. Heath then began to reduce our local parameters.

Your Statutory Officers, Local Government Act 1972 & 1992 are actually Aiding & Abetting as secondary offenders ... The continuing Deposing of a Monarch. They are VOID.

And since the Monarch was deposed, Treason was committed.

Coronation Oath Act 1688

Oath heretofore framed in doubtful Words.

Whereas by the Law and Ancient Usage of this Realme the Kings and Queens thereof have taken a Solemne Oath upon the Evangelists at Their respective Coronations to **maintaine the Statutes Laws and Customs of the said Realme and all the People and Inhabitants thereof** in their Spirituall and Civill Rights and Properties But forasmuch as the Oath itselfe on such Occasion Administred hath heretofore beene framed in doubtfull Words and Expressions with relation to ancient Laws and Constitutions at this time unknowne **To the end therefore that One Uniforme Oath may be in all Times to come taken by the Kings and Queens of this Realme and to Them respectively Administred at the times of Their and every of Their Coronation.**

IV Oath to be adminstered to all future Kings and Queens.

The Monarchs also swear to ‘govern the subjects under the Laws of God and the Gospels’.

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/cy/aep/WillandMar/1/6/1991-02-01/data.pdf>

Act of Settlement 1700

“ ... An Act of Parliament was made intituled [**An Act for declaring the Rights and Liberties of the Subject and for settling the Succession of the Crown**] wherein it was (amongst other things) enacted established and declared That the Crown and **Regall** Government of the Kingdoms of England ... ”

“^{F4}That after the said Limitation shall take Effect as aforesaid **no Person born out** of the Kingdoms of England Scotland or Ireland of the Dominions thereunto belonging (although he be ^{F5} ... made a Denizen (except such as [are] **born of English Parents**) **shall be capable to be privy Councill or a Member of either House of Parliament or to enjoy any Office of Trust** either Civill or Military or to have any Grant of Lands Tenements or Hereditaments from the Crown to himself or to any other or others in Trust for him] ”

“That no Pardon under the Great Seal of England be pleadable to an Impeachment by the Commons in Parliament.”

IV The Laws and Statutes of the Realm confirmed.

“And whereas the **Laws of England are the Birthright of the People** thereof and all the Kings and Queens who shall ascend the Throne of this Realm ought to administer the Government of the same according to the said Laws and all their Officers and Ministers ought to serve them respectively according to the same The said Lords Spirituall and Temporall and Commons do therefore further humbly pray **That all the Laws and Statutes of this Realm for securing the established Religion and the Rights and Liberties of the People** thereof and all other Laws and Statutes of the same now in Force may be ratified and confirmed And the same are by His Majesty by and with the Advice and Consent of the said Lords Spirituall and Temporall and Commons and by Authority of the same ratified and confirmed accordingly.”

“ ... Crown and **Regall** Government ... ” is also in breach! Sovereignty was Surrendered remember and hence there cannot be a ‘**Regall**’ government, it’s corporate.

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/aep/Will3/12-13/2/data.pdf>

We cannot acknowledge something that is not Regal, as in this statute ... Do Not Disobey A Statute.

Furthermore; Suella Braverman, daughter to parents both of Indian origin who emigrated to Britain in the 1960s. Nadhim Zahawi born into a Kurdish family in Bagdad, Iraq. Rishi Sunak etc etc etc...

Since 1st January 1973, there have been no Regal government – and none have complied with the Act of Settlement 1700.

Lord Denning ‘where a party holding high office breaks the law all after that point is VOID’.

Archbold, Criminal Pleading Evidence & Practice 2006, Ch1.6 : ... To disobey a Statute is an indictable offence and it specifically states Treason;

“ ... every such person and persons so as aforesaid offending shall be deemed, declared and adjudged **to be a traitor and traitors, and shall suffer pains of deaths, ... as in cases of high treason.**”

Once you bring the above mentioned to their attention, you are a ‘**Litigant in Person**’. They cannot come near you, they cannot touch you. **That is the Law of Procedure in Court Process.**

If they come near you, any parties interfering with you as a ‘Litigant in Person’, is **committing Contempt of Court and that goes under Justices of the Peace Act 1949.**

Protect your property – for this is what they want. They want to asset strip ‘We The People’, so protect your property.

If a claim for repossession is made from a bank, **only a jury can decide under the Bill of Rights** ... because they are attempting a **forfeiture** – BUT let it be known **only a man can make such a claim, not a corporation**, and again **only a jury can decide under the Bill of Rights.**

A utilities corporation for eg ... is represented by their solicitor in court – set aside the court is illegitimate in itself, you inform the solicitor to bring the witness forward.

If they are unable to, which they won’t because of the fact that the CEO is aiding & abetting in treason, and furthermore handling stolen goods, they will never step forward and hence no case ... it’s **null & void and therefore ab initio** (like it never happened).

4 days before court, slap the **Habeas Corpus** on their lap to **produce the claimant** - He who makes the claim, step forward from behind the corporation.

No claimant, No Claim – Lord Denning.

Habeas Corpus Act 1679

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/aep/Cha2/31/2/data.pdf>

Council tax – a summons from court (liability order) ... It’ll have your respective council but no name on it. It’s a ‘**nom de guerre**’ – **a dead legal fiction and cannot summon you** ... it cannot speak, cannot write, cannot step forward.

In Latin, a **summons** is ‘**an invite**’ ... so thank them and politely decline their invite. Is there any wonder why the schools stopped teaching Latin? Of course not – students began asking some very easy questions that became ever too difficult to answer. Their fraud and corruption was up.

Tony Blair; Land Registry Act 2002 – is corporate and we have never consented. We The People have only ever consented to a Constitutional Land Registry, not a corporate.

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2002/9>

He created the Land Registry Act 2002 to benefit the Private BAR Guilds ... to enable these reprobates to asset strip We The People.

Tony Blair turns everything corporate under the instruction of The EU/492003;

<https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=CELEX:32003L0049>

He stole everything – every Public Authority from this state and then under Gordon Brown in 2008 Clearfield Doctrine;

<https://thepeopleslawyeruk.com/wp-content/uploads/Exhibit-8a-Clearfield-doctrine.pdf>

To convert or sell or put a charge on something, when a bank does, ONLY the OWNER, the CEO of the bank can make that claim, not a corporate title.

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/aep/Cha2/31/2/contents>

Administrative courts cannot be legitimised, for every judge is an agent of the foreign state as are QCs / barristers / solicitors – **Private Bar Guild**, again committing **Treason**.

A judge creating the order for repossession has already broken the law – which means the order is void.

Lord Denning Void Order – “If an ORDER in court was made because the judge or any party to the judgement had no jurisdiction, broke the law or ignored due process, that order is VOID”

<https://thinkfree.org.uk/forum/index.php?topic=1952.0>

The judge has no jurisdiction because he broke the Coronation Oath 1688 and broke his Promissory Oath under 1868 Act.

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Vict/31-32/72/contents>

Land Registry Act 2002 is corporate – and remember, We The People have never consented to this ... We consented to a Constitutional Land Registry. IT IS VOID.

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2002/9>

Before it gets to repossession stage, you have to do some research on your bank (and ask the banking questions). They have already been paid handsomely by securitised instruments.

Contact the **Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC)** USA and **report them for fraud**. The bank will stand down – Only the owner of the bank can make the claim to reopen the case. This falls under **Uniform Commercial Code (UCC)** because you’re dealing with legal tender.

Please note: this is not only for the USA. When we read cases in the USA, decided by the Supreme Court etc, they are a BAR Council – British Accredited Registered.

This leads you back to the Inner City of London, a foreign state; every judge is registered to this foreign state, as stated above. Their first rule is to abide by the court not the client and have a separate Oath to a foreign state.

Q. How are We The People supposed to win?

A. We impose The Bill of Rights and a jury trial – We drag them back to the Constitution.

We take it to the right court; take it to a Court of Equity, Court of Chancery.

Take out **Form CH11**, which is an **Injunction Form** – you can take this out against the bank, the receiver or whomever and you can set the terms; If you violate this injunction, you could be sent to prison immediately, you can forfeit your personal property, you can forfeit your bank accounts ... you can enter what you want.

CH11 can be applied to anybody; Chief of Constable, Police, PM, Utility Companies (They are Agents of a Foreign State and cannot gain entry onto ‘Our Property’.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/form-ch11-order-for-interim-injunction>

Police claim to be a ‘Constable’ – but not a ‘Constitutional Constable’. We The People have never agreed to a corporate governance ... **This is fraud within itself.**

The Police – No longer take an Oath but an affirmation or an attestation. No police officer is beholden to protect us, We The People. They protect the Head of State, all her buildings etc. It is criminal fraud & deception, and they are not telling you the truth.

When the police give you an on the spot fine, this is criminal, they cannot do this; rely on the **Bill of Rights 1688 – “No fine or forfeiture without conviction before a jury of your peers.”**

When a summons is received (council tax bill for eg), the **council are acting as a jury**. This makes it **VOID**. Again, rely on the **Bill of Rights 1688 – “No fine or forfeiture without conviction before a jury of your peers”**.

In an administrative court; a judge fails to stamp and sign the order – **He does this, or not, because he is also liable in Treason. There is liability if he signs and stamps a court order.**

Halsbury's Laws of Parliament - No administrative court can be legitimised, because of a constraint on the Monarch's Oath.

Does this court (Magistrates) get its authority from the Magistrates Court Act 1980, and is the Equity, the court is using, that of British Pound Sterling (GBP)?;

If they confirm ‘yes’ – due to the UK surrendering sovereignty and joining the EEC on 1st January 1973 ... the monarch was deposed and given a change of title, The Head of State.

Therefore, any Act of Parliament / Statute and Law implemented post 1st January 1973 is ‘Treason’.

And if they say they are using GBP as Equity – as of the 1944 Bretton Woods Agreement; GBP was backed by US\$ and the US\$ backed by Gold;

Then on the 15th August 1971, Richard Nixon took the US\$ off the Gold Standards – The US\$ is printed by the Federal Reserve which is a Non-Governmental Independent US Corporation with shareholders ... and the meaning of this;

... that, anybody who is paid in GBP cannot therefore uphold their Judicial Oath because they are being paid and economically motivated by a Foreign Federal State of a US Independent Corporation, that is the Federal Reserve.

The Superior Statutes; Coronation Oath 1688 / Bill of Rights 1688/9 / Act of Settlement 1700 & Treason Act 1795 ... as of the Bill of Rights “No fine or forfeiture without conviction before a jury of my peers”;

All Administrative Courts have only one purpose, to try and obtain consent for Corporate Governance – and to try to get you to take responsibility for your Legal Fiction and make you Trustee of the Trust (that you / we are actually the Beneficiary of the Trust ... Cestui Que Vie 1688) – The only purpose these courts have;

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/aep/Cha2/18-19/11>

All administrative courts are fraudulent ... This is why a vast majority of We The People are taking them on in a **Court of Equity, Chancery**.

Once a party have broken the Law, they lose ALL Authority & Jurisdiction. And anything they create after that point of breaking the Law is **VOID**.

Under **Lord Denning; Bellinger v Bellinger – If a court order is not signed and stamped IT IS VOID**. Where is its validity?

The judge has no jurisdiction because he broke the Coronation Oath 1688 and broke his Promissory Oath under 1868 Act;

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Vict/31-32/72/contents>

Every judge is an agent of that foreign state by the BAR council – **All committing Treason**.

Private BAR Guild Courts have no legitimacy.

All judges are a corporation and not under their Oath – We can then put them under their Oath by typing out their Oath and asking them to sign it beforehand. And same as for the police because they are out of their jurisdiction.

If you’ve ever been in a court, it’s **Presumptive**. A magistrate walks in, and you Presume he/she is under Oath – in the US, everyday a judge will swear his Oath before he sits down.

In the UK, the judge is not establishing jurisdiction, by failing to actually take the Oath or confirm it – the judge has no authority, but **acting in colour of law** ... The case is **McCain vs Des Moines** (walk out).

And because no jurisdiction or authority has been established, any order made is **VOID** – **Lord Denning, Bellinger vs Bellinger**. **If an order is not signed by either a judge or a court officer and a court stamp, then it is VOID**, like it never happened.

Private Bar Guilds do not operate on first hand knowledge, they **operate on presumptions** – and **will stand as fact if not rebutted [12 Presumptions of Law]**.

A **judge** was challenged in court for his **name and address** from which the judge replied ‘I do not have to give you that’ ... the clerk however answered ‘Yes You Do’;

Under the Private Bar Guild, the judge is liable to do so – he is not however under his Public Oath.

To reiterate, the judge has no liability (to give his name & address) under his Public Oath, but he is liable under the BAR because he’s a Private Entity.

Any court that has the Royal Crest ... they have no right to use it, because they are corporate. Ask for the contract if the courts can use that because it’s under copyright.

Trust Law : - Trustee : Executor : Beneficiary (Any 2 of the 3);

In a court, the government make You/Us (The People) to be the ‘Trustee’ – which means ... You/Us are the party responsible to fix it, and make themselves out to be the ‘Beneficiary’.

As ‘Executor’ ... if You/Us have the authority to sign on behalf of something; Your/Our Trust, Your/Our Name ... You/Us are technically the ‘Executor’;

... and for what? For Your/Our ‘Benefit’. You/Us are the ‘Beneficiary’.

Your/Our government is the elected official, so by virtue of their own position as Your/Our Public Servant, they are Your/Our ‘Trustee’ – They are not acting on Your/Our behalf.

Fraud on the Court By the Court.

Halsbury’s Law of Distress

Here is the law from Halsbury's Law

“A distress in its ancient form may, therefore, be deemed as - The taking without legal process of a personal chattel from the possession of the wrongdoer or defaulter into the hands of the party grieved, to be hold as a pledge for the redress, performance, or satisfaction required.”

Halsbury's Laws of England/DISTRESS (VOLUME 13 (2007 REISSUE))/ 1. NATURE OF THE REMEDY OF DISTRESS/901.

Meaning of distress. DISTRESS (VOLUME 13 (2007 REISSUE)) 1. NATURE OF THE REMEDY OF DISTRESS 901. Meaning of distress. The term 'distress' primarily connotes a summary remedy by which a person is entitled without legal process to take into his possession the personal chattels of another person, to be held as a pledge to compel the performance of a duty, or the satisfaction of a debt or demand¹. By almost universal sanction the term 'dis-tress' is now used to designate both the process of taking, and the chattels taken², though originally it applied only to the taking.

Note : It does NOT require a legal process

Halsbury's Law states administrative courts unlawful.

by [steveadmin](#) on Friday, June 14th, 2019 | Comments Off

Halsburys Law states administrative courts unlawful.

Councils and The CSA may want to read this:

The law is absolutely clear on this subject. There is **NO** authority for administrative courts in this country and no Act can be passed to legitimise them because of the constitutional restraints placed upon her Majesty at Her coronation. The collection of revenue by such means is extortion, and extortion has been found reprehensible since ancient times.

Separation of powers Today, in the year 2011, we find for example, that in the council tax regulations, the billing authority, the prosecuting authority and the enforcement authority are all vested in the same body. The same bodies even purport to issue their own legal documents, by tacit agreement with the Courts. In our system of Common Law, the rule of law demands that we have a separation of powers.

Today, the powers are not separated. The executive is not a distinct, free-standing leg of the tripod. The executive now emerges directly from within the elected Chamber of the legislature where previously it emanated directly from the Monarch. That leads to constitutional confusion—because the executive has seized and misuses Parliament's democratic credentials for its own, destructive, purposes. Fortunately, we have something to which we can turn to preserve our ancient laws and freedoms. We have the Oath that Her Majesty The Queen took at her coronation by which she is solemnly bound and from which no one in England, Wales and Scotland has released her.

At Her Coronation the Queen swore to govern us, “according to [our] respective laws and customs”. Certainly, among our reputed “customs”, is precisely that invaluable and widely admired tripartite division of the powers. The judiciary is part and parcel of our customary system of internal sovereignty—“the Queen in Parliament”.

It is one of the three separate but symbiotic powers, and it is a capricious and self-serving contention that it should not have the power to preserve the authority of the legislature over the executive. It is a constitutional principle that the assent of the Queen & Parliament is prerequisite to the establishment of a Court which can operate a system of administrative law in Her Majesty's Courts in England.

This was confirmed by Lord Denning during the debates on the European Communities Amendment Bill, HL Deb 08 October 1986 vol 480 cc246-95 246 at 250: “There is our judicial system deriving from the Crown as the source and fountain of justice. No court can be set up in England, no court can exist in England, except by the authority of the Queen and Parliament.

That has been so ever since the Bill of Rights.” 08 -10 – 1986 vol 480 cc246-95 246 at 250. [15/12/2011 22:30:58] catherine.crossan1: Halsbury’s Laws of England/ADMINISTRATIVE LAW (VOLUME 1(1) (2001 REISSUE))/1. INTRODUCTION/(1) SCOPE AND NATURE OF THE SUBJECT/1. Scope.

1. INTRODUCTION

(1) SCOPE AND NATURE OF THE SUBJECT

1. Scope.

For the purposes of this work, administrative law¹ is understood to mean the law relating to the discharge of functions of a public nature in government and administration. It includes the law relating to functions of public authorities and officers and of tribunals, judicial review of the exercise of those functions, the civil liability and legal protection of those purporting to exercise them and aspects of the means whereby extra-judicial redress may be obtainable at the instance of persons aggrieved².

1 For at least half a century after the publication of Dicey’s Law of the Constitution (1st Edn) (1885), the term ‘administrative law’ was identified with *droit administratif*, a separate body of rules relating to administrative authorities and officials, applied in special administrative courts. As thus defined, administrative law did not exist in England: see Dicey’s Law of the Constitution (10th Edn) 330. See also *Re Grosvenor Hotel, London* (No 2) [1965] Ch 1210 at 1261, [1964] 3 All ER 354 at 372, CA, per Salmon LJ; *Ridge v Baldwin* [1964] AC 40 at 72, [1963] 2 All ER 66 at 76, HL, per Lord Reid (‘We do not have a developed system of administrative law—perhaps because until fairly recently we did not need it’). *Ridge v Baldwin* *supra*, however, and a number of decisions which followed it, marked a significant change in judicial attitudes towards judicial control of administrative action. See *Re Racal Communications Ltd* [1981] AC 374 at 382, [1980] 2 All ER 634 at 638, HL, per Lord Diplock (‘[The case of *Anisminic Ltd v Foreign Compensation Commission* [1969] 2 AC 147, [1969] 1 All ER 208, HL] is a legal landmark; it has made possible the rapid development in England of a rational and comprehensive system of administrative law on the foundation of the concept of *ultra vires*’); *Breen v Amalgamated Engineering Union* [1971] 2 QB 175 at 189, [1971] 1 All ER 1148 at 1153, CA, per Lord Denning MR (‘... there have been important developments in the last 22 years which have transformed the situation. It may truly now be said that we have a developed system of administrative law’); *IRC v National Federation of Self-Employed and Small Businesses Ltd* [1982] AC 617 at 641, [1981] 2 All ER 93 at 104, HL, per Lord Diplock (‘... [the] comprehensive system of administrative law [which] I regard as having been the greatest achievement of the English courts in my judicial lifetime’); *O’Reilly v Mackman* [1983]

2 AC 237 at 279, [1982] 3 All ER 1124 at 1129, HL, per Lord Diplock; Mahon v Air New Zealand Ltd [1984] AC 808 at 816, [1984] 3 All ER 201 at 207, PC ('The extension of judicial control of the administrative process ... over the last 30 years ... has already gone a long way towards providing a system of administrative law as comprehensive in its content as the droit administratif of countries of the Civil Law, albeit differing in procedural approach, [and] it is a development [which] is still continuing. It has not yet become static either in New Zealand or in England'); R v Lancashire County Council, ex p Huddleston [1986] 2 All ER 941 at 945, 136 NLJ Rep 562, CA, per Sir John Donaldson MR ('Notwithstanding that the courts have for centuries exercised a limited supervisory jurisdiction by means of the prerogative writs, the wider remedy of judicial review and the evolution of what is, in effect, a specialist administrative or public law court is a post-war development. This development has created a new relationship between the courts and those who derive their authority from the public law, one of partnership based on a common aim, namely the maintenance of the highest standards of public administration').

Original source: <http://www.landofthefree.co.uk/site/component/content/article/1-latest-news/123-administrative-courts-unlawful-halsburys-law>

Posted in Lawful Rebellion

If one has ever been in a court, it's 'Presumptive'.

Formal challenge to the Twelve Presumptions of Law, definition of Presumption;

<http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/presumption>

An idea that is taken to be true on the basis of probability: As a presumption, is a presumption on which must be agreed by the parties, to be true. THEN and EQUALLY If one party challenges the presumption to be true on the basis of probability. Then this is all that is recognised to be **required to remove the presumption is a formal challenge to that presumption**. The presumption then has no standing or merit in FACT. A probability:

http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/american_english/probability

The extent to which something is probable; the likelihood of something happening or being the case: By definition then this is not substantive as it is only a probability of what may be and therefore has no substance in material FACT. A State **Court does not operate according to any true rule of law, but by presumptions of the law**. Therefore, **if presumptions presented by the private Bar Guild are not rebutted, they become fact and are therefore said to stand true**.

A Magistrates walks in and you 'presume' he or she is under an Oath. By not doing so, the judge has NOT established his Jurisdiction and Authority by actually taking that, or confirming it;

Judge is OUT of his Jurisdiction – has NO Authority and is acting in 'Colour of Law', the case is **McCain v Des Moines**.

“Because you (the judge) have not established your Jurisdiction and Authority, therefore, ANY order you make today is **VOID [Lord Denning]**”.

Lord Denning said in **Bellinger v Bellinger**, “If an order is NOT signed by a Court Officer or a Judge, it is **VOID**”.

It’s like it never happened. Either a Judge or a Court Officer (can be a clerk) HAS to sign it AND a Court Stamp, stamped. Same applies to the Police as they are in YOUR jurisdiction. They are NOT in your jurisdiction as he is operating in a Corporate capacity.

1979-90 : What did Thatcher introduce in criminality?

The Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984

https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1984/60/pdfs/ukpga_19840060_en.pdf

The Supreme Court Act 1980

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1981/54/contents/enacted>

Magistrates Court Act 1980

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1980/43/contents>

They are ALL VOID – Acting in Treason.

She was also acting in Treason when she sold the Gas / Electricity / Water in the mid 80s;

Theft Act 1968 – Section 5 2A

5 “Belonging to another”.

(2) Where property is subject to a trust, the persons to whom it belongs shall be regarded as including any person having a right to enforce the trust, and an intention to defeat the trust shall be regarded accordingly as an intention to deprive of the property any person having that right.

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1968/60>

We The People created the utilities with our energy, blood & sweat ... We Own Them. They have been created for our Personal Security our Survival and Protection; and yet they are being stolen. They were sold in criminality.

We own the Water Company (Yorkshire Water, is just a name change to a LEGAL Embodiment).

Thatcher could NOT sell off or "privatise" gas, electric or water ...

Why?

It’s because we as Assured Party creditors never created a **WRITTEN DEED OF TRUST** for Thatcher to declare any Energy Company as being "**Absolute Owner Status**".

In 1996 the Trusts of Land and Appointment of Trustees Act 1996 came into force and requires a **WRITTEN DEED** granting absolute ownership rights - IT DOES NOT EXIST ...

The utilities will not go to court; ask Yorkshire Water (or any of the utilities) for the Written DEED of TRUST granting ABSOLUTE OWNER STATUS ... again, IT DOES NOT EXIST. As a single man/woman, those taxes have paid for every streetlamp, road, gas, water, electricity EVERYTHING ... Created by Us, We The People, and WE OWN it.

For Example; A 5G tower, the old GPO (Open Reach – which we still own / Title Changing only) being installed by workmen ... get them down and tell them to leave or will invoke Vaughan v Makenzie (Vaughan v McKenzie [1969] 1 QB 557) ... you're on Criminal Trespass on property part paid for Under **Theft Act 1968 Section 5 2A**, remove the trust. They packed up and left.

<https://www.dealingwithbailiffs.co.uk/VaughanvMcKenzie1969.htm>

All Political Parties should be declared as Terrorist Organisations.

The companies that bought them, Centrica, have knowingly received stolen goods.

The Seven Principles of Public Life also known as The Nolan Principles:

“All public office-holders are both **servants of the public** and **stewards of public resources**.”

Owners you are not but servants of the public and stewards of public resources. You are the ‘Trustees’ and We The People the ‘Beneficiaries’.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-7-principles-of-public-life/the-7-principles-of-public-life--2>

Remove the council; Every statutory officer – they are aiding & abetting Treason. Again, apply **Trespass under Theft Act 1968 Section 5 2A** ... If you don't move, I will move you. This is our property.

We are dealing with Legislation vs Law – The Law will always win ... In a Court of Equity, because legislation doesn't matter. In a Court of Equity, a corporation cannot challenge you – it has to be an individual.

It's for material things ... it is a different matter, and if fraud occurred, they have to prove they did not commit it and then it's your burden of proof to prove they have. Let a Jury decide (they will not like it ...).

The Court of Equity stands under the 4 Superior Statues.

Under the 1974 Jury's Act, created by Heath, is now gone. They cannot rely on it.

Q. Which other Jury can be created under Constitutional Law?

A. Under The Bill of Rights – Jury of your peers (you pick them).

Everything government does is aiding and abetting – Nothing was ever repealed.

If All Statutes and Acts since 1973 are claimed as VOID, you attach them in this way; Cf (at the beginning), ‘it’s similar to’. You are not accepting them, you’re just saying it’s similar to Fraud Act 2006, Section 3; Failure to give relevant information for eg; Cf.Fraud Act 2006 S3.

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2006/35/data.pdf>

We can take back Constitutional Governance in an instance – Within 3 months.

Justices of the Peace Act 1949

All you need is to set up a Commission called a Commission of the Peace.

This Commission of the Peace then appoints a Justice of the Peace – The JP then has the power vested in him by/from the Commission to appoint ‘Constitutional Constables’, which Blair decided to remove in 1995.

When you review the Justices of the Peace Act 1949 and then the Police Act 1965, we now have Constitutional Governance back.

We can only do this within a 15 mile radius of where the commission is set up.

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Geo6/12-13-14/101/part/I/enacted>

Union with England Act 1707 – IV

“That all the subjects of the United Kingdom of Great Britain shall from and after the Union **have full Freedom and Intercourse** of Trade and Navigation to and from any port or place within the said United Kingdom and the Dominions and Plantations thereunto belonging And that there be a Communication of all other **Rights Privileges and Advantages which do or may belong to the Subjects** of either Kingdom except where it is other ways expressly agreed in these Articles ... ”

XXV

That all Laws and Statutes in either Kingdom so far as they are contrary to or inconsistent with the Terms of these Articles or any of them shall from and after the Union cease and become **void** and shall be so declared to be by the respective Parliaments of the said Kingdoms

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/aosp/1707/7/data.pdf>

The use of the highway for the purpose of travelling and transporting (action), is not a mere privilege but a common and fundamental right of which the public and the individual cannot be rightfully deprived.

No state entity has the power to allow or deny passage upon the highways and transporting his vehicle and personal property for either recreation or business.

Operation of a motorised vehicle upon public streets and highways is not a mere privilege but is a right of Liberty and Protected by the guarantees of the British Constitution – Under the Bill of Rights.

Travel is not a privilege that can be permitted at will with forced insurance, registration or licences – but is a common and fundamental right of liberty granted by the Constitution.

When legislation was brought in, like yellow lines etc, they were brought in post 1973. They were created in criminal joint enterprise which are VOID.

On the 21st July 1993, the Speaker of the House of Commons issued a reminder to the courts. Betty Boothroyd said: “There has not been an amendment to The Bill of Rights ... the House is entitled that The Bill of Rights will be fully respected by all those appearing before the court.”

LEGITIMACY OF DPE/BILL OF RIGHTS 1689

For the avoidance of any doubt in the following matter it is very useful that the Houses of Parliament Transport Committee Press Notice (04/2005-06, 9 August 2005) refers to "parking fines". There can be no argument. If the Committee, the public, the Bulk Traffic Enforcement Centre at Northampton County Court and the legislators consider parking penalty charges as fines then the attempted justifications put forward by local authorities that it is not a fine but an "excess charge" or other play on words, it is clear to all that what we are dealing with here is a fine.

There is a provision in The Bill of Rights Act 1689 which states:

“That all grants and promises of fines and forfeitures of a particular person before conviction are illegal and void.”

This states that a conviction is necessary before a fine or forfeit can be imposed. As you will be aware, The Bill of Rights is a “**constitutional statute**” and may not be repealed impliedly. This was stated in the case *Thoburn v City of Sunderland*, the decision commonly referred to as the “Metric Martyrs” Judgment. This handed down in the Divisional Court (18 Feb 2002) by Lord Justice Laws and Mr Justice Crane.

“We should recognise the hierarchy of Acts of Parliament: as it were ‘ordinary’ statutes and ‘constitutional statutes.’ The special status on constitutional statutes follows the special status constitutional rights. Examples are ... The Bill of Rights 1689 ... ”

“Ordinary statutes may be impliedly repealed. Constitutional statutes may not ... ”

This was upheld by Lords Bingham, Scott & Steyn in an appeal which went to the House of Lords on Monday 15 July 2002.

Betty Boothroyd 2002 (Speaker of the House) sends a warning to the courts '**Hierarchy of Statutes against legislation**' ...

Therefore because of the rights of the individual are being removed in the name of parking "efficiency" than the resistance to DPE will grow and as more and more motorists realise the illegitimacy of the whole operation and begin to challenge and clog the system then it will collapse under its own bureaucratic burden.

<https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200506/cmselect/cmtran/748/748we10.htm>

Tax

The government is taking tax off the people illegally – they're not a 'Regal' government;

Duty on petrol for example – there are no Crown Officers to take the duty. Only a Crown Officer, appointed under The Great Seal can take taxes & duties. The Great Seal was removed in 1973 ... 1973 remember – It's Void!

Previously, every Monarch had their own Seal; each time an Act of Parliament or a Statute was passed or enacted by the Monarch by the Laws Temporal and Spiritual, a wax seal was used on the original ... This has been Removed!

The Custodian of Records, at Kew Gardens; they cannot provide an original wax seal after 1973 but do offer a copy. Thus, no Crown Officers to collect duties or taxes.

The Taxes Management Act 1970 S8 :

[F18Personal return.

[F2(1)For the purpose of establishing the amounts in which a **person** is chargeable to income tax and capital gains tax for a year of assessment, [F3and the amount payable by him by way of income tax for that year,] he may be required by a notice given to him by an officer of the Board—

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1970/9/section/8>

This act refers to Us The People as "a **person**" ... in their society, what is 'a person'?

Please refer to **Interpretation Act 1978** Schedule 1 (Words and Expressions Defined) S5

[F34"PAYE income" has the meaning given by section 683 of the Income Tax (Earnings and Pensions) Act 2003.

"PAYE regulations" means regulations under section 684 of that Act.]

"Person" includes a body of persons corporate or unincorporate. [1889]

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/cy/ukpga/1978/30/schedule/1>

Public Bodies Corrupt Practices Act 1889 S7

Interpretation.

In this Act—

The expression " public body " means any council of a county or county of a city or town, any council of a municipal borough, also any board, commissioners, select vestry, or other body which has power to act under and for the purposes of any Act relating to local government, or the public health, or to poor law or otherwise to administer money raised by rates in pursuance of any public general Act, but does not include any public body as above defined existing elsewhere than in the United Kingdom :

The expression " public office " means any office or employment of a person as a member, officer, or servant of such public body:

The expression " person " includes a body of persons, corporate or un incorporate:

<https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/Vict/52-53/69/section/7/enacted>

Interpretation Act 1889 S19

19. Meaning of “ **person** ” in future Acts.

“In this Act and in every Act passed after the commencement of this Act the expression “person” shall, unless the contrary intention appears, include **any body** of persons **corporate or unincorporate.**”

https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1889/63/pdfs/ukpga_18890063_en.pdf

We the people are not referred to as men / women but persons ... in the above section, pay attention to express words ‘any body’; it’s two separate words not one word ... there is now a very different outlook.